## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

*'* |

RONALD SMITH, No. C 01-3270 CW

ORDER RETURNING
DOCKET NO. 76 TO
THE CLERK FOR
ASSIGNMENT AS A
NEW ACTION

הזיייו 'כר

Plaintiff,

V.

JOHN E. POTTER, Postmaster General,

Defendant.

On March 9, 2012, an order from the Federal Circuit transferring <u>Smith v. United States Postal Service</u>, Case No. SF0752110001-I-1 (M.S.P.B.), Case No. 2011-3184 (Fed. Cir.), to the Northern District of California was docketed in the above-captioned case as Docket No. 76. However, it does not appear that the newly-transferred case is part of, or related to, the above-captioned action.<sup>1</sup>

¹ The newly-transferred case is a petition filed by Ronald Smith for review of a final decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board, which dismissed as moot Mr. Smith's appeal of the United States Postal Service's removal of him from his position as a mail-processing clerk in September 2010. See Smith v. U.S. Postal Serv., 2011 MSPB LEXIS 488 (M.S.P.B.), pet. for review denied, 2011 MSPB LEXIS 3219 (M.S.P.B).

United States District Court

1

3

4

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 II

27

28

Accordingly, the Court returns Docket No. 76 to the Clerk to be docketed as a new case and randomly assigned to a Judge in compliance with General Order 44.

If either or both parties believe that the new case is related to the above-captioned case, as defined in Local Rule 3-12, they may file an administrative motion to consider whether the cases should be related.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3/15/2012

United States District Judge

The above-captioned case arose out of a complaint filed in 2001 by Plaintiff Ronald Smith, who may or may not be the same individual as the petitioner in the newly-transferred case, alleging failure reasonably to accommodate his learning disability and discrimination on the basis of age, race and learning disability in failing to choose him as a supervisor in 1995. Court granted summary judgment in favor of Defendant John E. Potter on September 30, 2004. See Docket Nos. 60, 63, 64. decision was affirmed by the Ninth Circuit on appeal. Potter, 186 Fed. Appx. 733 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 549 U.S. 1007 (2006).